

They realized that by turning this extraordinary incident, extraordinarily terrible incident—and also by us changing our ordinary incidents—events in our lives into true occasions of loving and of serving God, our communities, and one another, that we begin to change society, not to mention ourselves, for the better. And more importantly, we change them in a way that mitigates against the evil influences that have come to dominate many aspects of this culture.

The Harris family could have used the horrors of this world as an excuse to turn away from God, but, you know, they didn't. Instead, they turned to God and asked quietly, asked humbly, not why—but what? "What do you want us to do? What can we do to make the world a better place? What can we do to keep the memory of our daughter alive?"

Out of that question came a wonderful foundation dedicated to preserving the memory of the daughter the Harris family lost and to fighting the spread of violent crime in our society.

Ann's Campaign for a Safer America—that is what this card is—was established by Jean and Coleman Harris following the brutal death of their daughter. Ann's Campaign for a Safer America seeks to encourage, motivate, educate, and help youth and adults alike to live the life radiated like their daughter did—a life that said every day and in every way: smile more, care more, love more and be more understanding.

The Harris family is combating violence by combating the problems that often lead to violence. And I believe Ann's Campaign is a unique opportunity to help contribute to the restoration of our culture by directly combating the influences that denigrate and ultimately compromise our moral worth as a nation.

The Harris family has turned a horrible event into an occasion of enriching the community and the country. We too can turn the events of our lives, the extraordinary, the terrible, and the good, along with the ordinary, into occasions of remembering to help others, to serve and to love, and to ask the question: Not why, but what? What? What should I be doing? How should I serve?

So I am joined by my colleague, Senator KEMPTHORNE, and several others, in this privilege of highlighting Ann's Campaign that we note here today.

I have a tie on as well that has smiling faces of children from around the world. That was the Ann Harris who I knew. I even knew her while her mother was pregnant with her. She had just a delightful smile and was a joy of life that was taken brutally.

I applaud what the Harris family has done, taking that incident and turning it into something of: What can we say to our culture? How can we change? Not "Why?" But "What?" I applaud what they are doing. I ask and hope and encourage my colleagues to look at

this as a campaign that they can help in as well as other people from around this Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, last spring, a bright young Fairfax County high school senior was murdered while visiting friends in Washington State.

Ann Harris was an honor student, a student leader, a gifted athlete, and a member of the Virginia All-State Chorus. Although she didn't live to graduate from Mount Vernon High School—where I graduated over 40 years ago—she carried a 3.4-grade point average and had been accepted, early admissions, to Purdue University. Last spring, Ann had a future filled with unlimited possibilities.

This fall, as I know her family continued to struggle with their loss, many of her friends in Mount Vernon's Class of 1997 left home to attend the college of their own choice. But they left home with a chilling loss of innocence—the innocence of those who don't know what it's like to lose someone you care about to a senseless act of violence.

We want our young people to be safe. Safe in our schools. Safe in our homes. Safe on our streets. We want them to live and learn and contribute to our country.

Ann's family joins us in the gallery today. Let us take this time to recommit ourselves to working for a safer America for all our children. Ann Harris deserved a future limited only by the borders of her dreams. And her friends deserved the innocence of not knowing someone—when you're 17 years old—who loses their future to a senseless act of violence.

I will conclude by commending Ann's family for creating Ann's Campaign for a Safer America. This campaign encourages all of us to live life as their daughter would have lived—to "smile more, care more, love more and understand more." As the father of three daughters whose smiles have brightened many rooms, I thank you for your efforts.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be recognized as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today we will be having some conversation on the floor concerning the global warming treaty. I will make a few comments concerning that in that I am the chairman of the Clean Air Committee of the Environment and Public Works Committee. We have had extensive hearings on this. I will review just very briefly what we have learned from the hearing that we held in our subcommittee in the Environment and Public Works Committee insofar as global warming is concerned.

In July, the Environmental Committee had a hearing on the global climate

change treaty and we heard from five top scientists.

The conclusions I found were very interesting, particularly since last night when I watched Administrator Carol Browner talk about the scientific evidence that is conclusive concerning global climate change. That is not at all what we found in our hearing. We had five of the top scientists around. While there is a large body of scientific research, there is much controversy and disagreement in scientific facts being misrepresented by the administration and the press.

Four things that we came to a conclusion on were, No. 1, we don't know how much human activity has influenced the climate. One scientist before our committee said it could be as much as 6 percent.

Second, if you look at satellite data, we are not sure if there has been any global warming. We had a very interesting session that lasted more than an hour with viewing the satellites and what conclusions could come, and there was no conclusive evidence that there has actually been any global warming.

Three, even if we eliminate all man-made emissions, it may not have a noticeable impact on the environment, and the treaty may only eliminate emissions here in the United States and not in the entire world.

Four, when asked, all five scientists stated that we would not have the uncertainties understood by this December, when the administration plans on making a decision regarding the treaty.

Now, we found out yesterday that the President came and made his announcement. It is kind of interesting, Mr. President, because we passed a resolution on the floor of the Senate, by 95 to 0, that said we would reject any type of a treaty that came from Kyoto that didn't treat the developing nations the same as the developed nations. So the President came out with something where he is calling for a binding 30 percent reduction in emission levels by the year 2012. He calls this an important first step, with more reductions to follow.

As chairman of the Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee, I can tell you that this is going to have a profound negative affect on our ability to defend America, as the President stated yesterday that the military accounts for 43 percent of the Federal energy use. The Federal Government cannot reduce by 30 percent or more without significant cuts in the military. I think this equates to something like a 3 to 7 times greater cut than the Btu tax of 1993.

One of the things that bothered me more than anything else is the moving target that we are dealing with. In March of 1995 in a House Commerce Committee hearing, Congressmen DINGELL and SCHAEFER raised concerns that the new targets may not apply to all countries equally, and on behalf of

the administration, Mr. Rafe Pomerance, a Deputy Assistant Secretary of the State Department said, "Our goal, Mr. Chairman, is that all parties participate in this next round of negotiations. We want to see that all governments participate and help define the post-2000 regime."

One month later, the administration signed on to the Berlin Mandate to review the commitments made to reduce the greenhouse gases and adopt targets for further reductions. The conference differentiated between developed and developing nations. They signed on to this, totally at odds and contradicting the commitment made to the Congressmen.

In June 1996, Mr. Pomerance stated, "Are we going to agree to legally binding instrument in Geneva? No way." One month later, Under Secretary Wirth announced that the United States supported a legally binding emissions target.

I want to also say that this has not changed since September 1996. It is before the same Commerce Committee. Assistant Secretary of State Eileen Claussen told Congressman DINGELL and the committee that the United States would not be bound before we have completed the economic analysis and assessments. We have just learned that the administration's efforts to analyze the economic effects has failed. The models they used did not work, and we will not understand the effect on our nation's economy certainly before December.

The reason I am concerned about this is, there is a very interesting parallel between what they are trying to do in the absence of any scientific evidence in global climate change, which has a dramatic deteriorating effect on our ability to be competitive on a global basis and on the ambient air changes promulgated by this administration. We all know that, just about a year ago, Carol Browner came out and unilaterally suggested—and now has promulgated—the rule change to lower the ambient air standards in both particulate matter and in ozone. We find that during the various hearings that we have had that Mary Nichols, who is immediately under Carol Browner, said that the cost would be \$9 billion to put these standards in—the cost to the American people. At the same time, the President's Economic Advisory Committee said it was \$60 billion a year. The Reason Foundation estimated the costs between \$90 billion and \$150 billion. This would cost the average family of four some \$1,700 a year.

They talk about the deaths, and Carol Browner reused this yesterday. There would be 60,000 premature deaths. Those deaths were lowered by the EPA last November to 40,000; then in December to 20,000, and in April to 15,000. Then the scientist who discovered the mathematic mistake now says it's less than 1,000. In our committee, Mary Nichols admitted these regulations would not save any lives over the next 5 years.

I have watched how Carol Browner goes around and makes promises. She says to the mayors of America, "This isn't going to affect you." She says to the farmers, "This isn't going to affect you." She says to small businesses, "This won't affect you." To some of the parishes in Louisiana that were found to be out of attainment, she said, "This isn't going to make you do anything because the problem is for the neighboring State of Texas to the west; they are going to have to do this."

So, Mr. President, I only ask the question, why is this obsession taking place in the administration if there is no scientific justification on either global warming or ambient air standards? Why are they trying to do this in eroding our personal freedoms? I think probably the best way to answer that is to read an article in *Forbes* magazine, called "Watch Out For This Woman; The EPA's Carol Browner is exploiting health and the environment to build a power base."

If you read this article, Mr. President, it says:

If science isn't Browner's strong point, political tactics are. Her enemies can only envy the way the EPA uses the courts.

... For her part, Browner often dismisses as simple male chauvinism any criticism of her hardball tactics.

... She learned politics working on Gore's Senate staff, where she rose to be his legislative director before heading back to Florida to head the State environmental commission.

... She is an environmentalist zealot.

Mr. President, I know my time has expired. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From *Forbes* magazine, Oct. 20, 1997]

CAROL BROWNER, MASTER OF MISSION CREEP  
(By Pranay Gupte and Bonner R. Cohen)

As the center of that enormous rent-seeking organization known as the federal government, Washington, D.C. has evolved its own vocabulary. There is, in bureaucratese, an innocent-sounding but insidious phrase: mission creep. Mark it well: Mission creep explains a lot about how big government grows and grows and grows.

Mission creep is to a taxpayer-supported organization what new markets are to a business organization. It involves a gradual, sometimes authorized, sometimes not, broadening of a bureaucracy's original mission. It is a way to accrete money and power beyond what Congress originally approved when it funded an agency.

Playing mission creep is an old game in Washington. But no one has ever played the game with more skill than Carol M. Browner, Bill Clinton's choice to head the Environmental Protection Agency.

From a modest beginning a quarter-century ago, the agency has grown to employ nearly 20,000 people and control an annual budget of \$7 billion. But these numbers are a poor measure of the agency's power: Because its regulations have the force of law, the agency can jail people, close factories and override the judgments of local authorities.

In its quest for power and money, the agency has imposed many unnecessary costs on American industry, and ultimately on the American people—costs that do more to sat-

isfy bureaucratic zeal than to clean the air or the water.

The EPA was established in 1970 by an executive order issued by President Richard M. Nixon. Rachel Carson, a patron saint of the environmental movement, had made a huge impact with her emotional tract, *Silent Spring*, a few years earlier.

The public was right to be alarmed. Industrialization has imposed hidden costs in the form of polluted air, despoiled streams, unsightly dumps and a general degradation of the landscape. Concerns about pollution could, of course, have been dealt with by existing agencies, but that is not the nature of American politics. Politicians must be seen to be doing something dramatic. Creating new agencies makes favorable waves in the media.

Nixon created a new agency. Pulled together from a hodgepodge of existing federal programs, the EPA never had a congressional charter that would have defined its regulatory activities. It was simply given the task of carrying out the provisions of what, over time, became 13 environmental statutes, each with its own peculiarities and constituencies.

Without perhaps fully comprehending the issues, Nixon made the new EPA the instrument for a tremendous power grab by the federal government. Most environmental problems—chemical spills, groundwater contamination, abandoned dump sites—are purely local in nature. But suddenly they were federal matters. In the name of a greener, cleaner Earth, Washington mightily increased its power to intervene in the daily lives of its citizens. It was a goal so worthy that few people saw the dangers inherent in it. Mission creep had begun.

In 1978 then-EPA administrator Douglas Costle cleverly shifted the focus of the agency. Henceforth the EPA would protect not just the environment but your health. "Costle became determined to convince the public that [the] EPA was first and foremost a public health agency, not a guardian of bugs and bunnies," wrote Mark K. Landry, Marc J. Roberts and Stephen R. Thomas in their book, *The Environmental Protection Agency: Asking the Wrong Questions from Nixon to Clinton*.

People do care about forests and wildlife, but they care much more about themselves and their families. There is a strong strain of hypochondria in the American people, and nothing grabs our attention faster than an alleged threat to our health. If the alleged threat involves cancer, it is almost guaranteed to make the six o'clock news. Costle shrewdly exploited cancerphobia to expand his agency's reach and to wring money from Congress. He launched the EPA on a cancer hunt, looking for carcinogens in foods and air and water, even in the showers we take.

Carcinogens, of course, abound in nature, ordinary sunlight being one of the most prevalent. So it is with many man-made substances. The exposure to background levels of these carcinogens is so minimal in most cases as to pose no serious threat in the overwhelming majority of cases. Never mind: EPA scientists, following the agency's cancer-risk guidelines, were soon ignoring the age-old admonition that the "dose makes the poison." If it was man-made and carried carcinogens, the EPA would root it out. As one EPA scientist explained it to *FORBES*: "At EPA, we're not paid not to find risks."

Under the mantra of "one fiber can kill," the EPA in the 1980s mounted a costly and probably self-defeating nationwide effort to rip asbestos out of schools. Simply sealing the substance would have kept the fibers away from kids at a fraction of the cost. But it would not have yielded the same harvest in headlines.

Even more than her predecessors—and possessing much greater resources—Carol Browner presents herself as the great family physician. “There isn’t a decision I make on any given day that’s not related to the health of the American people,” she tells *FORBES*. Browner, it’s worth noting, is a lawyer with no medical training.

After all, she reminds us, she’s the mom of a young boy. Attendees of Capitol Hill hearings snicker at her constant references to her son, Zachary, when she testifies on environmental issues. But she never misses a chance to repeat the message. “If we can focus on protecting the children . . . we will be protecting the population at large, which is obviously our job,” she tells *FORBES*.

Who said that was her job? Nobody, but that’s what mission creep is all about.

Last September Browner announced the release of a new EPA report setting forth a broad national agenda to protect children from environmental risks. She followed up the report with the creation earlier this year of the Office of Children’s Health Protection at EPA.

There was no congressional mandate, but Congress meekly went along by failing to challenge the agency’s justification of the program. Who would want to face reelection accused of being callous toward children? Especially when the EPA’s kept researchers stand by ready to produce scare studies on EPA money (see box, p. 172).

Where most agency chiefs tremble at criticism from Congress, Browner has a platform from which she can counterattack. An EPA-funded newsletter was recently distributed by the National Parents Teachers Association. At the time an internal EPA memo noted: “The PTA could become a major ally for the Agency in preventing Congress from slashing our budget.” Thus does Browner’s EPA use taxpayer money to fight efforts to trim the federal budget.

On Mar. 15, 1995 David Lewis, an EPA scientist attached to the agency’s laboratory in Athens, Ga., was told by his supervisor that EPA employees with connections to members of Congress should use their influence to sway lawmakers against a bill proposed by Representative Clifford Stearns (R-Fla.)—if it could be done “without getting into trouble.” Stearns’ bill would have reduced funding for EPA. The scientist later said in a deposition: “We were being asked to do this during government business hours, and the purpose was to protect EPA funding levels.” This request on the part of high-level EPA officials to lobby Congress on government time is under investigation by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

Had this been a Republican administration and had the department involved been other than the EPA, one can imagine the outcry in the media.

Asked about the growing criticism of her tactics, Browner blatantly ducks the question with: “This isn’t about me. It never has been about me. It’s about the air being cleaner. Is the water going to be safer? It’s about business going to be able to find a better solution to our environmental problems.”

It’s really about politics. When supportive lawmakers ask to borrow EPA experts for their staffs, the EPA hastens to comply. Requests from liberal Democrats almost always are filled, those from Republicans rarely. A request by Representative Richard Pombo (R-Calif.) for an EPA detailee was rejected on Jan. 2, 1997 on the grounds that “new procedures” were being written. Less than four weeks later (Jan. 28), a similar request from liberal Democrat Representative Charles Rangel of New York was approved, without reference to any “new procedures.”

Since 1995 her office has approved all requests for employee details to four Democratic lawmakers—Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.), Senator John Kerry (D-Mass.), Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.) and Rangel. Of the four GOP requests, three were rejected.

Browner was at her politically impressive best in this summer’s debate over the EPA’s tougher clean air standards. Because air quality levels have improved markedly since passage of the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, it was widely hoped—especially in areas that badly need new jobs—that the standards would not be further tightened. The EPA’s own data showed that levels of the particulates have dropped dramatically over the past decade. Many local governments, anxious for jobs and economic development, were looking forward to being removed from the list of so-called nonattainment areas for ozone and particulate matter, or PM.

In July the EPA finalized new tighter standards for ozone and PM. For communities that had made expensive efforts to comply with the current law, the higher standards were like a baseball player, having rounded third base and heading toward home, being told he had to circle the bases again to score.

A good many congresspeople were outraged. Browner’s insistence on imposing the new standards in the face of nothing more than scanty scientific evidence unleashed howls of protest from elected officials in the affected communities.

Legally, Browner was probably in the right. In its haste to seem to be attending to the environment, Congress failed to exert control over EPA standards and regulations.

There was nonetheless quite a donnybrook, with veteran Democrat John Dingell of Michigan leading the charge against Browner. A lot of jobs were at stake in Michigan, still headquarters of the U.S. auto industry. Congress, he insisted, should be consulted. Dingell was not alone.

With lots of support from Vice President Al Gore’s office, Browner went to work putting down the congressional revolt. Her testimony before Congress was, by general agreement, brilliant, though her facts were often shaky.

Until then, Bill Clinton had remained on the sidelines. But Browner maneuvered the President into a corner, where he faced the politically embarrassing choice of supporting her controversial initiatives or disavowing his outspoken EPA administrator. Clinton then got to the head of the parade by declaring his support for Browner. The game was over. Browner 1, Congress 0.

If EPA’s new standards survive congressional and legal challenges, state and local governments will have to devise elaborate State Implementation Plans, or SIPs, detailing their strategies for complying with the agency’s latest regulatory diktat. And in accordance with the Clean Air Act, it will be up to the EPA to approve or disapprove the SIPs. The estimated cost of compliance with the new standards for the Chicago area alone is projected to be between \$3 billion and \$7 billion.

“I wish we never had that fight with Congress,” she tells *Forbes*. “I wish it could have been avoided. I think it came at great expense to the country. I think it was very unfortunate.” Note the implication: The way it could have been avoided was for Congress to avoid challenging her.

You can admire Browner’s skill and still be appalled by what she is doing. “This is by far the most politicized EPA I’ve seen in my three decades of working in state governments,” says Russell J. Harding, director of Michigan’s Department of Environmental Quality. “It is an agency driven more by sound bites than by sound science.”

Says Barry McBee, chairman of the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission: “EPA continues to embody an outdated attitude that Washington knows best, that only Washington has the capability to protect our environment. States are closer to the people they protect and closer to the resources and can do a better job today.”

As a weapon to humble the state regulatory bodies, Carol Browner’s EPA has embraced the politically correct concept of “environmental justice.” This broadens EPA’s mandates even beyond protection of everyone’s health.

In early 1993 Browner set up the Office of Environmental Justice within EPA which, among other things, passes out taxpayer-funded grants for studying the effects of industrial pollutants on poorer, mostly black, communities. In 1994 the White House supported this initiative by ordering federal agencies to consider the health and environmental effects of their decisions on minority and low-income communities.

That’s the rhetoric. The reality is that the federal agencies have a new weapon for overruling state agencies. Browner’s EPA recently delayed the approval of a \$700 million polyvinyl chloride plant to be built by Japanese-owned Shintech in the predominantly black southern Louisiana town of Convent. Louisiana’s Department of Environmental Quality had already given the go-ahead; the plant would have created good-paying jobs and opportunities in an area suffering from 60% unemployment and low incomes. But the EPA argued that blacks would suffer disproportionately from potentially cancer-causing emissions of the plant in an area already lined with chemical factories of all descriptions.

Louisiana Economic Development Director Kevin Reilly was enraged. “It is demeaning and despicable for these people to play the race card,” he says, pointing out that poor people and blacks would have gained economically and were at little health risk. The scientific evidence bears Reilly out: A recent article in the *Journal of the Louisiana Medical Society* found that cancer incidence in the area is in most cases no higher than nationally.

But never mind the facts: This kind of decision has less to do with science than with power politics. It delivers the message: Don’t mess with the EPA. “Carol Browner is the best hardball player in the Clinton Administration,” says Steven J. Milloy, executive director of The Advancement of Sound Science Coalition in Washington, a longtime critic of EPA who acknowledges receiving funding from industry. “She has the 105th Congress completely intimidated by her debating skills and her sheer grasp of facts, however questionable. She eats their lunch.”

Like many Clintonites, Browner takes her own good time about responding to congressional requests for EPA documents. When word got out that EPA was developing a series of proposals for reducing U.S. emissions of man-made greenhouse gases, the House Commerce Committee asked for a copy. The EPA ignored the request for two years.

When the proposals were leaked to the committee late last week, it was immediately clear why EPA had stiffed Congress. The document was loaded with proposals for raising taxes to pay for new EPA initiatives. Produced in the agency’s Office of Policy, Planning & Evaluation and dated May 31, 1994, EPA’s “Climate Change Action” recommends a new 50-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax, with an estimated cost to motorists of \$47 billion in the year 2000 alone. Seven other tax increases were recommended: a “greenhouse gas tax,” a “carbon tax,” a “btu tax,” an “at-the-source ad-volorem tax” on the value of the fuel at the source of extraction,

an "end-use ad valorem tax" on the value of the fuel at the point of sale, a "motor fuels tax" on the retail price of gasoline and diesel, an "oil import fee." Also recommended: A new federal fee on vehicle emissions tests of \$40 per person to "shift the cost of vehicle inspection from the state to the vehicle owner."

How could they hope to get so many new taxes through a tax-shy Congress? The "Climate Change Action Plan" contains repeated references to how each of the above taxes and fees can be imposed under existing laws. Talk about taxation without representation.

It's not entirely surprising that Browner and her crew think in terms of government-by-edict. Browner's extraordinary power is in many ways a consequence of Congress' delegation of its lawmaking power to the EPA. It has let the agency micromanage environmental activities throughout the nation with little regard for either local wishes or the cost. This negligence has permitted the agency to ignore scientific data that conflict with agency orthodoxy. The EPA is in many ways becoming a state within the state.

"This is Washington at its worst—out-of-touch bureaucrats churning out red tape with reckless abandon. The EPA hasn't taken into account an ounce of reality," says Representative Fred Upton (R-Mich.), a frequent critic, referring to the new clean air rules.

If science isn't Browner's strong point, political tactics are. Her enemies can only envy the way the EPA uses the courts. An organization such as the Natural Resources Defense Council will go into federal court and sue to force the EPA to do something. The EPA will wink and, after the courts expand its mandate, see to it that big legal fees go to the NRDC.

Mission creep, in short, takes many forms and its practitioners have many ways to plunder the public purse.

For her part, Browner often dismisses as simple male chauvinism any criticism of her hardball tactics. "I think sometimes that it's an issue of men and women," she says, coyly.

Such cute demagoguery aside, there is no doubting Browner's sincerity. She is an environmentalist zealot. She was clearly behind the decision to tighten the clean air standards to what many people regard as unreasonable levels. If not a tree-hugger she is philosophically close to Al Gore and his quasi-religious environmentalism.

After graduating from University of Florida law school, Browner (both of whose parents were college teachers) went to work for a Ralph Nader-affiliated consumer advocate group. There she met her husband, Michael Podhorzer, who still works there.

She learned politics working on Gore's Senate staff, where she rose to be his legislative director before heading back to Florida to head the state environmental commission.

After the EPA, what's next for this tough and aggressive politician? If Al Gore's presidential hopes aren't dashed by the fund-raising scandals, there's vice presidential slot on the Democratic ticket up for grabs in 2000. A female environmentalist and mother of a young boy would do a lot to bolster Gore's otherwise soggy appeal.

In a statement to *Forbes*, Gore went so far as to try to claim for Browner some of the credit for the current economic prosperity. "She has helped prove," he declares, "that a healthy environmental and a strong economy are inextricably linked."

If not a vice presidential run, what? Could Browner be nominated by the Clinton Administration to be the next head of the United Nations' environment program? Or would the Administration nominate her as the new

U.N. Deputy Secretary General? Either position would give Browner instant international visibility, which couldn't hurt her political prospects in Washington.

One way or another, you are going to be hearing a lot more about Carol M. Browner; whenever you do, it's unlikely to be good news for business—and it may not even be good news for the environmental.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I believe that we have 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina is here. So with your permission, we will proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. FORD and Mr. FAIRCLOTH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1310 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from Nebraska is recognized. There will now be 35 minutes under control of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL].

#### THE GLOBAL CLIMATE TREATY

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States announced the United States negotiating position on the U.N. global climate treaty. Some have called the President's position a compromise. I would say that is the case only if you define compromise as an action that would have devastating consequences for the United States without any meaningful progress toward the overall goal.

This is how an editorial in *Investors Business Daily* defined the President's proposal yesterday morning. This doesn't make any sense. "Signing a treaty that hobbles U.S. growth getting no environmental payoff in return." Now, here is what does make sense. "Listening to science rather than overheated rhetoric and acting on the basis of real events, not computer models."

The President's announcement follows along the same lines of what this administration has been pushing in international circles for years. No matter how he wraps his package, the President is still talking about making the United States, our businesses, our people, subject to legally binding international mandates while letting more than 130 nations off the hook. Most important for this body, the U.S. Senate, is how does the administration's position stack up against the Byrd-Hagel resolution which passed this body in July by a vote of 95 to zero? The Clinton administration's position announced yesterday falls woefully short on all counts.

The President obviously realizes this since he stated yesterday that America cannot wait for the U.S. Senate on this issue. The President said:

I want to emphasize that we cannot wait until the treaty is negotiated and ratified to act.

This flies in the face of the Constitution and the powers it gives to the U.S. Senate to give approval for the ratification of treaties. Why does the President's proposal fall short? Regarding participation by the developing nations, the Byrd-Hagel resolution states very clearly that no treaty will get the support of the U.S. Senate unless, and I read from the Byrd-Hagel resolution, " \* \* \* unless the protocol or agreement also mandates new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for developing country parties within the same compliance period."

That is very clear. I noted some of my colleagues yesterday, and others, have said what the President proposed yesterday is in full compliance with Byrd-Hagel. I strongly recommend to those colleagues who actually believe that, that they go back and read the Byrd-Hagel resolution. It is only five pages long. It is not legal. It is very clearly understood by everyone.

What this means also is that support of the U.S. Senate is contingent upon China, Mexico, India, Brazil and the other 130 developing nations committing to specific limitations on greenhouse gas emissions within the same time period as the United States and the other industrialized nations. Anything less, anything less than this, what is clearly defined in the Byrd-Hagel resolution put forward by the U.S. Senate, is not in compliance and it is the U.S. Senate that will have the final say on any treaty signed by the administration in Kyoto, Japan, in December.

At the same time President Clinton was calling for "meaningful participation"—those were his words—meaningful participation by the developing countries, at the same time he was saying that, this is what his negotiator in Bonn, Germany, Ambassador Mark Hambley, was saying in a prepared release. "In our view," said Ambassador Hambley, the President's negotiator in Bonn Germany this week—"In our view, this proposal is fully consistent with the Berlin mandate—it imposes no new substantive commitments on developing countries now. Instead, it calls for such obligations to be developed following the third conference of the parties" in Kyoto in December.

I think that is rather clear, what Ambassador Hambley said: That the Third World, the developing nations, would not be called upon for any commitments, any obligations in this treaty. It is obvious that this administration has no intention of ensuring that the developing countries have to meet the same obligations as the United States.